

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

It is respectfully believed that the above Election and amendments to the claims, including the canceling of claims 7, 13 - 22, and 24 - 33, are correct and comply with the appropriate MPEP provisions as referred to in the above identified Paper.

The basis of Amendment A was the application in the computer of the undersigned. However, upon noting the discrepancy between the claims in Amendment A and the above noted Paper, the application as filed was checked and a discrepancy was found. The reason of the discrepancy is not known, but the computer has now been reconciled with the application as filed. Accordingly, it is believed that the above elected claims and the canceled and newly presented claims are correct.

Claims directed to the nonelected species have been canceled.

The two cited references have been carefully reviewed and it is submitted that the independent claims 1 and 34 clearly define over the references.

The Patent Publication discloses an inverted U-shaped element disposed in a narrow trench over a single conduit. Nothing in the Publication suggests that end plates may be disposed in a trench with a bridge secured to the end plates. The structure of the Publication requires a very specific sized trench, while the width of trenches in most cases may vary, and accordingly end plates such as disclosed and claimed are efficient

and practical for trenches of varying widths. The end plates are virtually universal, with the length of a bridge selected according to the width of the trench.


The structure disclosed in the Derwent publication is likewise inapposite to the structure of the present invention. Again, there is no suggestion of using a pair of end plates and a connecting bridge for retaining conduits in a trench. The structure includes a block with grooves for receiving cables and an inverted U-shaped clip element with barbs for securing a cable in the groove of a block.

With the independent claims allowable, the dependent claims are also allowable. However, the independent claims also define structure neither suggested nor taught by the cited references.

If the Examiner would prefer language other than that employed, it is requested that the undersigned Attorney of Record be called in order to expedite the prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

DANIEL D. EVANS, Applicant

By 
H. Gordon Shields,
Attorney of Record

HGS:sf
Enclosures
Phoenix, Arizona
(602) 997-4979